

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated April 22, 2004. Claims 1-20 were pending in the application. In the Office Action, claims 1-20 were rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1, 10 and 11 have been amended. Claims 1-20 thus remain for consideration.

Applicants submit that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in light of the following remarks.

**§103 Rejections**

Claims 1-4, 10-14 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama et al. (U.S. Patent 5,633,723), presumably in view of Katsuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,259,859).

Claims 5, 7, 8 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama et al. in view of Katsuki et al. and further in view of Kono et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,187,589).

Claims 6 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama et al. in view of Katsuki et al. and further in view of Yamamoto (U.S. Patent No. 5,469,270).

Claims 9 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama et al. in view of Katsuki et al. and Kono et al. and further in view of Yamamoto.

Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims (claims 1, 10 and 11) are patentable over Sugiyama, Katsuki, Kono and Yamamoto.

Applicants' invention as recited in the independent claims is directed toward a video recording apparatus and method, and to a centralized monitoring recording system. Each of the claims recites "dividing a memory of [a recording apparatus] into a plurality of blocks, said plurality of blocks being equal to [a] plurality of video images supplied from each of [a] plurality of input data streams." Supporting disclosure for the memory dividing feature of Applicants' invention can be found in the specification at, for example, page 12, lines 15-24.

Sugiyama, Katsuki, Kono and Yamamoto do not disclose a "dividing a memory of [a recording apparatus] into a plurality of blocks, said plurality of blocks being equal to [a] plurality of video images supplied from each of [a] plurality of input data streams."

Accordingly, Applicants believe that claims 1, 10 and 11 are patentable over Sugiyama, Katsuki, Kono and Yamamoto – taken either alone or in combination – on at least this basis.

Claims 2-9 and 18 depend on claim 1. Since claim 1 is believed to be patentable over the cited references, claims 2-9 and 18 are believed to be patentable over the cited references on the basis of their dependency on claim 1.

Claims 12-17 and 19 depend on claim 11. Since claim 11 is believed to be patentable over the cited references, claims 12-17 and 19 are believed to be patentable over the cited references on the basis of their dependency on claim 11.

Claim 20 depends on claim 10. Since claim 10 is believed to be patentable over the cited references, claim 20 is believed to be patentable over the cited references on the basis of its dependency on claim 10.

Applicants submit that all of the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references represent the present opinions of the Applicants undersigned attorney and, in the event that the Examiner disagrees with any such opinions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the respective reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By:



Bruno Polito  
Reg. No. 38,580  
(212) 588-0800